

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-16, 18, 21 and 22 have been amended to further improve their clarity and form. Claims 27-41 were previously canceled. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-26 and 41-48 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Response to Claim Objection

Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 22 were objected to for the reasons discussed in paragraph 2, at pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended: (a) claim 1 to replace “sulphur” and “polythiosulphenamide” with --sulfur-- and --polythiosulfenamide--, respectively; (b) claim 1 to replace “a divalent bond group, whether straight-chain or branched” with --a straight-chain or branched divalent bond group--; (c) claim 6 to delete the Markush group language; (d) claim 12 to replace “reinforcing inorganic filler” with --the inorganic filler--; and (e) claims 16, 18 and 22 to add “and” after the word “propylene,” as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

II. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-26 and 42-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in paragraph 5 at page 3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims as amended are not indefinite.

Specifically, in the present Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended to delete the words "possible" and "possibly," respectively; claims 4, 7-9, 14, 15 and 21 have been amended to replace "may be identical or different" with --is(are) identical or different--; and claim 7 has been amended to replace "a hydrocarbon group " with --a group consisting of carbon, hydrogen and optionally one or more heteroatoms--.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

III. Response to Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-26 and 42-48 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-20, 22 and 23 of copending Application No. 10/482,152 (published as US 2004/0254269).

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot because the '269 publication has become abandoned, as the status from the PTO PAIR database shows as of August 16, 2007, and thus is no longer copending with the present application.

IV. Examiner's Comments in Paragraph No. 7

It is the Examiner's position that claims 1-26 and 42-48 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 2004/0254269.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Specifically, the '269 publication was filed August 3, 2004, subsequent to the June 24, 2002 effective filing date of the present application. In addition, WO 2003/002574, which is the application publication of PCT/FR02/02229, on which the '269 publication is based, was published in French. Therefore, the '269 publication

does not have a § 102(e) prior art date. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the '269 publication is not proper prior art against the present claims.


V. **Conclusion**

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (202) 452-7932 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 9, 2007

By: 
Fang Liu, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,283